

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

I. STATUS OF CLAIMS

Claims 1-20 are pending. Claims 1, and 12 have been amended to further clarify that the adsorption assembly comprises two adsorption stages for holding the silicon wafers during an adsorption process, the anneal assembly comprises two anneal stages for holding the silicon wafers during an annealing process, and the cooling assembly comprises two cooling stages for holding the silicon wafers during a cooling process. Moreover, claims 2, 5, 9, 13, 15 and 18 have been canceled herewith without prejudice.

Support for the above amendments may be found throughout the specification as originally filed. No new matter has been added by virtue of this amendment.

II. 35 U.S.C. 103(a) Rejections

Claims 1-20 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 4,816,098 to Davis ("the Davis patent") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,909,994 to Blum et al. ("the Blum patent").

To establish prima facie obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art. (See MPEP 2143.03; *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 USPQ 580 (CCPA 1974)).

In response, it is respectfully asserted that the combination of Davis and Blum fails to teach or suggest all of the features recited in claims 1 and 12.

As noted above, claims 1 and 12 have been amended to further clarify that the adsorption assembly comprises two adsorption stages for holding the silicon wafers during an adsorption process, the anneal assembly comprises two anneal stages for holding the silicon wafers during

an annealing process, and the cooling assembly comprises two cooling stages for holding the silicon wafers during a cooling process.

The combination of Davis and Blum at the very least fails to teach or suggest a remote plasma enhanced cleaning apparatus which includes an adsorption assembly, anneal assembly and a cooling assembly disposed in a main process chamber, and wherein the adsorption assembly comprises two adsorption stages for holding the silicon wafers during an adsorption process, the anneal assembly comprises two anneal stages for holding the silicon wafers during an annealing process, and the cooling assembly comprises two cooling stages for holding the silicon wafers during a cooling process, as recited in claims 1 and 12.

As conceded by the Examiner, Davis fails to teach or suggest two stages (adsorption, annealing or cooling) in a single processing chamber. (See **page 3 of the instant Office Action**). Furthermore, Applicants submit that the Blum reference fails to cure the above noted deficiency of the Davis reference.

In contrast, the Blum patent includes a tandem process chamber 106 having two processing regions 618, 620 in a chamber body 602 as shown in the Figs. 18-19. However, as shown in Fig. 19, the first processing region 618 and the second processing region 620 are separated respectively. Elements such as distribution systems 608 and pump port 631 are separated and mounted in the first processing region 618 and the second processing region 620, respectively. Accordingly, a tandem processing chamber 106 in the Blum patent is substantially a double chamber unlike a single assembly chamber for adsorption, annealing and cooling as required by claims 1 and 12.

Thus, even if Davis and Blum were combined, this combination at the very least would fail to teach or suggest a remote plasma enhanced cleaning apparatus which includes an adsorption assembly, anneal assembly and a cooling assembly disposed in a main process chamber, and wherein the adsorption assembly comprises two adsorption stages for holding the silicon wafers during an adsorption process, the anneal assembly comprises two anneal stages for holding the silicon wafers during an annealing process, and the cooling assembly comprises two cooling stages for holding the silicon wafers during a cooling process, as recited in claims 1 and 12. Therefore, for at least the reasons set forth above, withdrawal of the above rejection to

claims 1 and 12 is respectfully requested. As claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 8, 10 and 11 depend from claim 1 and claims 14, 16, 17, 19 and 20 depend from claim 12, withdrawal of rejections to these dependent claims is likewise requested.

III. CONCLUSION:

In summary, applicants respectfully submit that the instant application is in condition for allowance. Early notice to that end is earnestly solicited.

If a telephone conference would be of assistance in furthering prosecution of the subject application, applicant requests that the undersigned be contacted at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,



Scott L. Appelhaunt
Reg. No. 41,587
Attorney for Applicants

F. Chau & Associates, LLC
130 Woodbury Road
Woodbury, NY 11797
Tel: (516) 692-8888
Fax: (516) 692-8889